

Reply to Office Action dated January 13, 2004  
Application No. 09/114,352

**REMARK/ARGUMENTS**

Favorable reconsideration of this application, as presently amended and in light of the following discussion, is respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 4, and 6-22 are presently active; Claims 1 and 8-22 having been amended by the present amendment.

Claims 1, 4, 6-10, and 15-18 were rejected under 35 U.S.C 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hamilton et al (U.S. Patent 5,579,055) in view of Davis et al (U.S. Patent 5,559,548) and further in view of Klosterman (U.S. patent 5,550,576). Claims 11-14 and 19-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Davis et al in view of Terasawa et al (U.S. Patent 6,147,714).

Firstly, Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the courtesy of Examiner Koenig and Supervisory Patent Examiner Srivastava to conduct an interview in this case on March 31, 2004. During the interview, the issues identified in the outstanding Office Action were discussed, as substantially summarized herein. In particular, the amended changes filed as an Amendment under 37 C.F.R. 1.116 on March 15, 2004 were discussed. As noted on the Interview Summary Sheet, these changes would appear to overcome the applied art of record.

No agreement on patentability was reached pending further search. Indeed, in order to expedite prosecution, it was discussed during the interview that the claims be amended to clarify, as shown in Applicants' Figure 1, that the EPG data is added at the broadcasting station.

Given this understanding, the present amendment clarifies that the EPG data is altered (or added) at the first broadcasting station data such that the EPG displays, with preference

Reply to Office Action dated January 13, 2004  
Application No. 09/114,352

and within a row of the display that includes at least the provider tag and a program name, the provider tag of the first broadcasting station among a plurality of broadcasting stations.

Davis et al, cited in the outstanding Office Action for its teaching of providing a preference to one of the provider tags, do not disclose or suggest that the preference is made within a row of the display including at least the provider tag and a program name. Davis et al display only one piece of information in the region cited in the Office Action as showing a preference (i.e., the product logo region of Figure 5a). In the rows listing channels and program names, Davis et al show no preference.

Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the presently amended independent Claims 1 and 8-22, and the claims dependent therefrom, patentably define over the applied prior art.

Reply to Office Action dated January 13, 2004  
Application No. 09/114,352

Consequently, in view of the present amendment and in light of the above discussions, the outstanding grounds for rejection are believed to have been overcome. The application as amended herewith is believed to be in condition for formal allowance. An early and favorable action to that effect is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND,  
MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.



Bradley D. Lytle  
Registration No. 40,073  
Attorney of Record  
Ronald A. Rudder, Ph.D.  
Registration No. 45,618

CUSTOMER NUMBER

22850

Tel: (703) 413-3000

Fax: (703) 413-2220

BDL:RAR:clh

I:\ATTY\RAR\AMENDMENTS\203593US\AMRCE1.DOC